

12 January 2021

New regulations came into effect on 4 April 2020 to allow Councils to hold meetings remotely via electronic means. As such, Council and Committee meetings will occur with appropriate Councillors participating via a remote video link, and public access via a live stream video through the [Mid Sussex District Council's YouTube channel](#).

Dear Councillor,

A meeting of **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH** will be held **VIA REMOTE VIDEO LINK** on **WEDNESDAY, 20TH JANUARY, 2021 at 5.00 pm** when your attendance is requested.

Yours sincerely,
KATHRYN HALL
Chief Executive

A G E N D A

Pages

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1. | Roll Call and Virtual Meeting Explanation. | |
| 2. | To note Substitutes in Accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4 - Substitutes at Meetings of Committees etc. | |
| 3. | To receive apologies for absence. | |
| 4. | To receive Declarations of Interests from Members in respect of any matter on the Agenda. | |
| 5. | To confirm the Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth held on 22 October 2020. | 3 - 8 |
| 6. | To consider any items that the Chairman agrees to take as urgent business. | |
| 7. | Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document - Response to Consultation. | 9 - 40 |

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| 8. | Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth -
Work Programme 2020/21. | 41 - 42 |
| | | |
| 9. | Questions pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 10.2 due notice of
which has been given. | |

To: **Members of Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth:**
Councillors N Walker (Chair), C Laband (Vice-Chair), R Bates, M Belsey, P Brown,
E Coe-Gunnell White, R Cromie, R Eggleston, S Hatton, J Henwood, G Marsh,
J Mockford, A Peacock and R Webb

**Minutes of a meeting of Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning
and Economic Growth
held on Thursday, 22nd October, 2020
from 5.00 - 6.36 pm**

Present: C Laband (Vice-Chair)

R Bates	R Cromie	G Marsh
M Belsey	R Eggleston	A Peacock
P Brown	S Hatton	R Webb
E Coe-	J Henwood	
Gunnell White		

Absent: Councillors N Walker and J Mockford

Also Present: Councillors A Bennett, P Chapman, A Eves and I Gibson

Also Present as Cabinet Members: Councillors S Hillier, J Llewellyn-Burke , R de Mierre and A MacNaughton.

1 ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETING EXPLANATION.

The Chairman carried out a roll call to establish attendance at the meeting. The Chairman proposed Cllr Marsh is elected as Vice-chairman for the meeting, this was agreed by a vote. The Solicitor to the Council provided information on the format of the virtual meeting.

**2 TO NOTE SUBSTITUTES IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE
RULE 4 - SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ETC.**

Councillor Pulfer substituted for Councillor Walker and Councillor Dabell substituted for Councillor Mockford.

3 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies were received from Councillors Mockford and Walker.

**4 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT
OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

Councillor Eggleston declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 8 as he is an appointed trustee of the Beehive, Burgess Hill and is a Member of Burgess Hill Town Council. Councillors Pulfer and Bates declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 8 as they are both Haywards Heath Town Councillors. Councillor Laband declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 8 as he lives within the area identified on Haywards Heath Town Centre's Master Plan. Tom Clark, Solicitor declared a non-prejudicial interest

in item 8 as he owns a flat within the area identified on Haywards Heath Town Centre's Master Plan.

5 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH HELD ON 29 JULY 2020.

A minor amendment to the minutes was agreed, "In response to a Members concern about cycle parking at commercial premises, the Urban Designer noted that it was referenced under DG24 but in a residential setting". The amended minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29 July 2020 were agreed as a correct record with 10 votes in favour, 1 against, and 2 abstentions. These were electronically signed by the Chairman.

6 TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.

None.

7 PARKING STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2020 - 2030

Claire Onslow, Business Unit Leader Parking Services advised that the current Parking Strategy expired in 2020. She reminded the Committee that a cross party working group had been set up to lead on refreshing the strategy and Parking Matters Ltd had been appointed as the consultant. This high-level strategy provides a 10-year strategic framework for the future management of the Council's car parks with the overall objective to support sustainable economic growth. The strategy has a 5-year rolling action plan to ensure it remains agile and relevant in the current and future economic climate and takes into account the anticipated impact of the Coronavirus pandemic. The prediction for economic recovery has been based on previous economic recessions. She noted that the Working Group had agreed the document in principle and if it was approved today Council would consider adoption in December 2020.

Several Members of the Working Group welcomed the comprehensive document, thanked the Working Group and officers and expressed support for the recommendations.

Members discussed Electric Vehicle Charging points (EVCs), the use of digital technology to manage the Council's car parks, subsidised parking for retailers and future use of car parking sites.

The Business Unit Leader for Parking Services reiterated that this was a high-level document and further work streams would provide more detailed proposals for Members to consider in due course. She noted that as part of a separate sustainability work stream a tender was underway and work would start next year on installing 26 new EVCs. Any future demand would be identified in the Investment Strategy.

Judy Holmes, Assistant Chief Executive advised the Council has not been approached to provide subsidised parking for retailers and the Council's approach would be to work with all employers to encourage the use of season tickets. Each request would be considered on a case by case basis. She confirmed the Working Group had seen evidence to support the proposals in the Strategy and Action Plan.

Stephen Hillier, Cabinet Member for Economic Growth added that Cabinet would discuss any such request. The Chairman noted that Waitrose in Burgess Hill subsidises car parking for its customers to raise footfall in its store. Members discussed how the Government's aim to promote and encourage support of local businesses would integrate with the strategy and the future size of parking spaces.

The Business Unit Leader advised that a feasibility study of each car park, would identify the community's needs, as a one size fits all approach is not appropriate. This work will inform the development of the strategy.

Councillor Gary Marsh, Chairman of the Parking Strategy Working Group thanked the members of the working group and Parking Matters. He reminded Members that it is a high-level strategy and a long-term plan. He urged members to support the recommendations.

Members expressed concern with the change of shopping habits due to Covid-19 and discussed employment travel plans, season tickets and tariffs.

The Business Unit Leader for Parking Services commented that the Council must take stock of their estate and future plans. Modal shift work starts in 2022 and the Council will work with employers and West Sussex County Council to ensure their travel plans are monitored. The future operation of season tickets and the tariffs is being explored in feasibility work and will be reported back to Members. A virtual season ticket would give the Council more options for a flexible tariff, more agility and meet customer demand.

Rob Anderton, Divisional Leader for Commercial Services and Contracts advised that the Working Group discussed season tickets at length and concluded that they are still an important part of the overall parking offer. The Council will still provide season tickets. They are used by local residents and workers as well as commuters.

In response to a Members question on the comparison of tariffs of adjoining authorities and the duration of the action plan, the Assistant Chief Executive advised that Lewes District Council already has a differential parking tariff regime and Wealden do not charge for parking. The strategy provides a framework for the strategic direction which is in line with the District Plan, a rolling action plan allows for agility.

The Chairman asked how many pay and display car parks have the Park Mark accreditation and was it the Council's aspiration to get all car parks accredited. The Business Unit Leader advised she would report back on the number already accredited, and future investment is planned to obtain accreditation for more car parks.

The Chairman confirmed that Cabinet would receive an annual review on the Parking Strategy.

As there were no further questions the Chairman took the Committee to the recommendations which was agreed with 12 votes in favour and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED

That the Scrutiny Committee for Planning, Housing and Economic Growth:

- a. Considered the Parking Strategy and Action Plan 2020 – 2030 and Covid Addendum and provides comments and observations to Council.
- b. Recommended to Council that the Parking Strategy and Action Plan 2020 – 2030 be approved.

8 HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT - CONSULTATION DRAFT

Andrew Marsh, Business Unit Leader for Planning Policy introduced the report. He commented that the Town Centre plays a vital role in the heart of the community, and it must remain vibrant and prosperous. Haywards Heath has good transport links, and a good public realm, which the Master Plan seeks to regenerate. The high-level framework of the Master Plan will provide clarity for the community and investors. It will also support bids for future funding and priorities for future projects. The Master Plan will be a material consideration for future planning schemes and will replace the existing 2007 Masterplan. It will not set policy but will supplement District Plan policy DP2. The Masterplan draws together a number of existing studies such as those prepared by the County Council and Town Council.

The Business Unit Leader highlighted various sections of the report and confirmed that the inclusion of a site in the Master Plan does not confirm the site is available. He noted the public consultation in November and December and the Community Involvement Plan. The consultation results will come back to the committee in January 2021 and the Council will consider the next version for adoption in March 2021.

Several Members welcomed the comprehensive report and the Chairman commented that the public need to contribute to ensure a robust document going forward. Members questioned how the Council would engage the public in the consultation in the current pandemic.

The Business Unit Leader confirmed the current restrictions regarding the pandemic had been considered. He noted that the Council had received a good response to virtual consultations over the last six months. To encourage participation in the consultation, an interactive map facility was being made available on the website. Consultees could then click and view the proposals and interact that way. Copies of the Master Plan would be available in the library, help-point and the Town Council's office for inspection should restrictions allow. They hoped to include an article in the next edition of Mid Sussex Matters as it is distributed to every household in the District, ensuring a wide reach. There would also be the usual press release and listings on social media.

In response to a Member's question, Sally Blomfield, Divisional Leader for Planning & Economy advised that Burgess Hill has a strong variety of employment sectors, and the banking and financial sectors of Burgess Hill had been included as they are the strongest examples. She stated the time frame of the Master Plan was 2031, to tie in with District Plan and references to short, medium and long term was in this context.

Members expressed concern that on-street parking causes traffic congestion, queried the use of Controlled Parking Zones, timing for the introduction of 20 mph zones, and plans for a multi storey car park at The Orchards.

The Business Unit Leader advised that the operation side of parking is not in the high-level Master Plan as that will be covered by other work streams. The reduction of traffic is a key part of the Plan. The aspiration is to make South Road and The Broadway more pedestrian friendly. The inclusion of traffic calming, pedestrian crossings and speed limits should divert traffic to the relief road where there is greater capacity. Further projects will investigate the design and effectiveness of other measures. He confirmed a multi storey car park at The Orchards was part of the proposals on page 126 which contain a number of principles for consideration at design stage

In response to a Member's question on the boundary for Haywards Heath Town Centre and why Boltro Road was not included, the Business Unit Leader advised it covered areas which contained Town Centre uses, as described on page 133 of the report. He reminded the Committee that this was a draft document, subject to a public consultation, where other views could be expressed.

Members expressed concern that the public might get confused with this consultation and that of the future use of Clair Hall.

Rob Anderton, Divisional Leader for Commercial Services and Contracts confirmed he would work with the policy team to ensure the processes for the consultations align and there should be no confusion for the public. He noted that the users of Clair Hall would be consulted through the use of a consultant.

In response to a question about the detailed proposed layout of the gyratory, the Business Unit Leader confirmed that this is a high-level plan only, setting principles, and stakeholders would be involved at the design stage of schemes. The Master Plan only establishes aims and principles.

Andrew MacNaughton, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning thanked the Business Unit Leader for his thorough introduction. He highlighted that the Council must consider the comments received.

As there were no further questions the Chairman took the Committee to the recommendations which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the Scrutiny Committee:

- (i) Considered the Consultation Draft Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan SPD;
- (ii) Delegated authority to Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, in consultation with the Cabinet Member, to make typographical, grammatical and photographic editorial changes before consultation; and
- (iii) Recommended that Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning approves the document for public consultation.

**9 SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH
- WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21.**

Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services introduced the Committee's Work Programme. He noted the report on the outcome of the public consultation on the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan would be on the agenda for the January meeting.

The Chairman noted that no more Members wished to comment on the Work Programme and so moved to the recommendation to note the Committee's Work Programme which was agreed with 11 votes in favour and 1 against.

RESOLVED

The Committee noted the Committee's Work Programme as set out at paragraph 5 of the tabled report.

**10 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE
OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

None.

The meeting finished at 6.36 pm

Chairman

HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN CENTRE MASTERPLAN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

REPORT OF: BUSINESS UNIT LEADER – PLANNING POLICY
Contact Officer: Andrew Marsh
Email: andrew.marsh@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477488
Wards Affected: All Haywards Heath Wards
Key Decision: No
Report To: Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth
Date of meeting: 20th January 2021

Purpose of Report

1. This report requests the Scrutiny Committee to consider the proposed changes to the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) following public consultation and to recommend adoption by the Council.

Summary

2. This report:
 - a) Sets out a summary of the responses received from public on the draft Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan (the draft Masterplan);
 - b) Sets out proposed changes to the draft Masterplan; and
 - c) Sets out the next steps towards adoption.

Recommendations

3. **That the Scrutiny Committee:**
 - (i) **Considers the consultation responses on the consultation draft Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan;**
 - (ii) **Considers the proposed modifications to draft Haywards Heath Masterplan set out in Appendix 1; and**
 - (iii) **Recommends to Council, subject to the modifications set out in Appendix 1 being implemented, that the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan is adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document**
-

Background

4. At its meeting of 22nd October 2020, the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth considered a draft Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan (the draft Masterplan). The Committee agreed unanimously that the Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning approve the document for public consultation.

5. Public consultation was held for 6 weeks between 9th November – 21st December 2020. The consultation was carried out in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and the Community Involvement Plan (CIP). This included:
 - publishing the details on the Council's website,
 - Notification using the Council's social media feeds (Facebook and Twitter)
 - providing an interactive map facility to view the proposals – this was viewed over 7,500 times,
 - an email and letter notification to statutory consultees and those on the Council's consultation mailing list,
 - a press release and coverage in local newspapers such as the Mid Sussex Times, and
 - an article in the Council's magazine (Mid Sussex Matters) which is delivered to every household within the district.
6. There is no statutory or local requirement to hold a public exhibition, however, in order to encourage responses 'exhibition panels' summarising the key points of each proposal were included in an interactive map and were available to download from the Council's website.
7. This report sets out a summary of the issues raised during the consultation. It also sets out the modifications proposed to the draft Masterplan in response to consideration of the representations made.

Response to Consultation

8. A total of **243** respondents made 424 comments on the draft Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan.
9. Respondents were able to make their comments using:
 - **eForm Questionnaire** – this posed a series of questions related to each proposal/element of the Masterplan as well as the opportunity for respondents to provide written free form comments. A total of 117 respondents used this method.
 - **Email/Post** – respondents were able to provide comments and attachments via email/post. A total of 126 respondents used this method.
10. Responses were received from:
 - **Residents:** 219 respondents
 - **Organisations:** 9 respondents
 - **Statutory Bodies:** 8 respondents (Environment Agency, Gatwick Airport, Highways England, Historic England, National Grid, Natural England, Southern Gas Networks, West Sussex County Council)
 - **Town and Parish Councils:** 4 respondents (Haywards Heath Town Council, Ardingly Parish Council, Cuckfield Parish Council, Lindfield Parish Council)
 - **Town Councillors :** 1 respondent
 - **Local Authority:** 1 respondent (Tandridge District Council – no comment)
 - **Site Promoter:** 1 respondent (representing promoter of Opportunity Site G – “2 The Broadway”)

11. A summary of the comments made by respondents during the consultation period is contained in **Appendix 1**.

Vision and Objectives / Principle of Preparing a Masterplan

12. The majority (70%) of respondents to the questionnaire agreed that the Masterplan should aim to encourage economic recovery, growth and investment, which is the key aim of the Masterplan.
13. Four responses questioned whether the draft Masterplan was sufficiently ambitious and whether it fully reflected the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Masterplan acknowledges that Covid-19 will change the way that town centres operate, particularly in the short-term. However, the medium to longer term impacts are not yet known. The Masterplan therefore aims to set agile principles to support economic recovery and growth.
14. A mixed response (50% agree, 50% disagree) was received in relation to the 8 Town Centre Objectives. No additional objectives were proposed, and none were suggested for deletion in their entirety.
15. Objections to the Vision and Objectives primarily related to:
- compatibility between encouraging sustainable transport at the same time as potentially increasing parking provision or encouraging parking, and not enough mention of public transport (3 comments)
 - the closure of Clair Hall appears to conflict with the objective to nurture community and attracting people to live and work in the town centre and should to refer to retaining community uses (4 comments)
 - lack of reference to climate change / sustainable development matters (3 comments) The Haywards Heath Town Council supported the Vision and Objectives

Response

16. Officers are not proposing to make any changes to the Vision and Objectives other than to Objective 3 which can be amended to include reference to public transport. Objective 1 refers to nurturing community and attracting people to live, work and visit and this includes community uses. Objective 3 refers to sustainable travel which will contribute towards sustainable development goals. A Supplementary Planning Document cannot set policy therefore policies related to climate change (e.g. building standards) can only be considered in a strategic document such as the District Plan.

Consultation

17. A total of 9 comments objected to the adequacy of consultation, particularly the length and timing of the consultation and that a public exhibition was not held. However, the Council is satisfied that, given the measures set out in paragraph 5 above, that best practice was followed and that the consultation was robust.

Public Realm and Transport Infrastructure

18. The draft Masterplan proposes a number of Public Realm and Infrastructure improvements. Overall, these were supported. The following represents a high-level summary of responses, more detail can be found in **Appendix 1**.

- **Commercial Square and Station**

65% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 12% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

In particular, residents agreed with the proposals for signage and better lighting/treatment of the railway bridge.

As this proposal was supported, no amendments are proposed.

- **Perrymount Road**

67% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

Residents agreed that this is a key route. However, concerns were raised about whether potential for cycle lanes would meet design standards. Additional clarity will be provided based on further guidance from West Sussex County Council.

- **Muster Green Gyratory**

56% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

The removal and reconfiguration of the gyratory was supported by residents overall, with few objections questioning the need/cost of doing so. Haywards Heath Town Council objected to this element as an alternative arrangement/layout was preferred. West Sussex County Council noted that any future scheme will need to be modelled fully at detailed design stage and this will be added for clarity.

- **The Broadway**

66% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 11% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

Strong support was received regarding proposals at The Broadway, with some commenting that the plans could have gone further in relation to pedestrianisation. However, the consultants concluded this was a Primary Road (page 25) therefore it has an important role for vehicle access and movement within the town.

As this proposal was supported, no amendments are proposed.

- **South Road**

52% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 20% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

The principle of reducing traffic and making the area more pedestrian friendly were supported. Concern was raised by Metrobus that slowing traffic may increase congestion. Some residents commented that the plans could have gone further in relation to full pedestrianisation. However, the consultants

concluded this was a Primary Road (page 25) therefore it has an important role for vehicle access and movement within the town.

Additional clarity will be provided in relation to meeting design standards in consultation with West Sussex County Council and bus companies.

- **Sussex Road**

62% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 13% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

Comments received were supportive of the proposals and identified the benefits that these would bring.

As this proposal was supported, no amendments are proposed.

- **Speed Limit**

62% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

There was strong support from both residents and Haywards Heath Town Council for the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in key areas of the town centre.

As this proposal was supported, no amendments are proposed.

- **Cycling**

61% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 19% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

Comments were received in relation to specific designs and standards. It should be noted that detailed specific designs would be investigated further when schemes are brought forward. Alternative routes were suggested out of the town centre to adjoining villages, or within the remainder of the town. It should be noted that the Masterplan can only set principles for areas within its boundary.

In response to comments received, additional text will be included to refer to appropriately designed and located cycle storage.

- **Parking**

31% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 54% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

The Masterplan proposes consolidating the existing small car parks (Haywards West, Haywards East and Franklynn Road) into a multi-storey at The Orchards with the aim of improving capacity overall, making it easier for visitors to find a space and reducing congestion in searching for a vacant space. This supports Objective 4. The response to this proposal was mixed, with 54% disagreeing with the proposal overall and 68% disagreeing with the specific principles set out for the redevelopment of the three car parks for residential use (Opportunity Sites C, D and E). In particular, concern was raised regarding the accessibility of businesses on Sussex Road and Haywards Road which would be impacted by their closure.

The closure of smaller car parks will be subject to additional further work through the Council's Parking Investment Strategy, which will consider capacity and other measures. Any proposed closure of car parks will take account of the aforementioned responses. This will be clarified within the Masterplan.

- **Victoria Park**

67% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

Residents supported the role Victoria Park plays in providing leisure and open space within the town centre, and that there was potential to open it up for community uses (particularly at the northern end). However, concern was raised by 5 residents around the removal of the hedge.

This proposal was supported in the main, therefore no amendments are proposed.

- **Gateways and Wayfinding**

64% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 14% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

The principle of improving navigation around the town was largely supported. In particular, it was felt that tourists and visitors would benefit.

As this proposal was supported, no amendments are proposed.

- **Other Small-Scale Improvements**

63% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

These proposals were largely supported, based on the questionnaire response. No additional comments were provided on this matter; therefore, no amendments are proposed.

- **Meanwhile Uses**

51% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this proposal, 11% disagreed or strongly disagreed (the rest were unsure).

These proposals were largely supported. No additional comments were provided on this matter; therefore, no amendments are proposed.

Opportunity Sites

19. The draft Masterplan identifies "Opportunity Sites" within the Town Centre boundary that have potential for regeneration and renewal and which could help deliver the Vision for the town centre. The identification of these sites does not imply they are available or viable, and additional work will be required to establish the precise opportunities these sites could provide.

20. A series of Aims and Principles have been established for each of these areas to guide future development and respondents were asked to comment on them. It should be noted that the Masterplan does not contain specific detailed proposals. It seeks to set broad aims and principles which would apply should any redevelopment be proposed for these sites.

- **The Orchards**

The Masterplan sets out three measures that aim to increase footfall, encourage a flourishing night-time economy, and maintain an attractive destination for those wishing to trade (both by retaining existing tenants and encouraging new ones). The Masterplan therefore proposes:

- Incorporating other uses, e.g. leisure or community;
- Improving the public realm and built environment; and
- Enhancing Town Centre parking

63% of respondents supported the principle of encouraging non-retail uses to The Orchards, recognising the benefits this would bring in terms of footfall, encouraging night-time economy and ensuring the centre remained vibrant and viable. A total of 9 responses suggested this would be a good location for the provision of a cinema, community/leisure building or library to help drive footfall.

In relation to improving the public realm, 62% agreed. Comments received noted that the centre feels tired and in need of a facelift, and that improvements would encourage more shoppers, retailers and other uses.

Nine respondents raised concerns about the provision of a multi-storey car park at this location, with 56% of questionnaire respondents disagreeing that The Orchards should be the focus for car parking. In particular the respondents referred to multi-storeys feeling unsafe, are urbanising, would dominate the area and impact on neighbouring amenity. Whilst the Masterplan includes safeguards related to design, officers propose that changes be made to strengthen these requirements should a multi-storey car park be proposed in the future.

- **Clair Hall**

Given its strategic location and that the building was nearing the end of its economic life, the Clair Hall site was identified as an Opportunity Area within the 2007 Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan.

The site continues to represent an opportunity for regeneration. The Masterplan sets out Aims and Principles to guide future development. The first principle requires an assessment to be undertaken to establish the need for such a facility and whether community facilities could be re-provided on this site or elsewhere in the town. Other important principles such as the relationship with existing buildings and Clair Park are also set out.

The Masterplan consultation asked a series of questions related to the Clair Hall site. These sought views on the content within the Masterplan but also sought the community's views on the permanent closure of Clair Hall. The response to these additional questions will be used to inform the assessment of need, in line with the requirement of the first principle of the Masterplan and will help to inform decisions about the future provision of community

facilities. Although this work is ongoing and is separate to the Masterplan, for completeness officers have summarised all the response in Appendix 1.

Sixty two percent of respondents indicated that they disagreed with the principles set out in the Masterplan. However, the associated written comments generally related to the closure of the building and overall principle of redevelopment not to the planning principles set out in the Masterplan. Indeed, there was only one comment, from Historic England (below), relating to the planning principles that would apply should redevelopment be proposed.

In order to provide clarity on this point, Officers propose to amend the text related to the Aims and Principles to reinforce the fact that the planning principles only apply if the first principle (related to the assessment of need and options for re-provision) has been satisfied.

Historic England requested that the Heath Conservation Area should be adequately protected from any redevelopment of the site. The Aims and Principles in the draft Masterplan already refer to the conservation area and the need for any redevelopment to accord with District Plan policy DP35: Conservation Areas. Therefore, officers propose no further changes.

- **MSDC Car Parks**

As noted in paragraph 18: 'Parking', the majority of respondents to the questionnaire (68%) did not agree with the principle of redeveloping the three small car parks. In addition, 33 comments from residents and local businesses, referring to the impact on adjacent businesses and reduced ability for their customers to park, were received.

Since the consultation commenced, the Council has adopted a Parking Strategy. A key action in the plan is to develop an Investment Strategy which will consider usage/capacity and future proposals for the MSDC car parks.

The Aims and Principles for the Car Parks would only apply should the decision be made in the future to redevelop them. To address these concerns, officers propose to make the approach towards the decision making clearer in the supporting text for this section. However, officers recommend that the development principles set out be retained in order to guide any future development proposals should they be brought forward in the future.

- **Additional Opportunity Sites**

The draft Masterplan also identifies 8 additional opportunity sites that have potential for smaller-scale improvements. These are located in prominent/gateway locations, the principles for each relate to supporting vibrancy and vitality.

Site (G) "2 The Broadway" and (I) "59-83 South Road" (previously occupied by Woolworths/Co-Op) received overall support.

Concern was raised about existing occupants. The Masterplan is clear that these are opportunities only, and do not imply that the sites are available or

viable, and that further work would be required to bring these forward. However, officers propose to review the text to provide clarity.

A number of comments suggested that Stockwell Court should be added to the list of additional opportunity sites. Given that this is a significant flatted development above a range of mixed-use units and given the high number of different ownerships within the building, it is unlikely that a viable and deliverable scheme could be developed within the timeframe of the Masterplan however reference can be added to improving shop facades on this site.

Implementation

21. The Masterplan includes an Implementation Strategy. Seven comments were received relating to implementation, with no overall objection. Amendments were suggested to improve clarity which officers agree with and these will be included in the Masterplan.

Amendments Proposed to the Masterplan

22. Appendix 1 contains the detailed response by officers to the points raised, and suggested amendments to be made to the Masterplan as a result ahead of recommending it to the Council for adoption. The proposals and principles within the Masterplan are in the main supported. Therefore, only a small number of amendments to improve clarity or correct factual errors are required ahead of adoption.

Next Steps

23. Subject to Member consideration, the draft Masterplan will be revised in accordance with the proposed changes set out in Appendix 1.
24. Following this the Council will be asked to consider the final version of the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan (incorporating the proposed changes) and to adopt the Masterplan as a Supplementary Planning Document.
25. Once adopted the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan SPD will be a material consideration in the consideration and determination of planning applications. It will also be used to stimulate inward investment and to inform any investment funding opportunities.

Other Options Considered

26. An option would be to not adopt a Masterplan and rely on District Plan Policy DP2: Town Centre Development. However, this is a general policy and does not provide the level of supplementary detail or certainty to support economic recovery and assist in securing inward investment in this location.

Financial Implications

27. The costs of preparing the Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan have been funded from the Development Plan Reserve.

Risk Management Implications

28. The Government's focus is on economic recovery and growth, and ensuring vitality of Town Centres, which this Masterplan supports.

Equality and customer service implications

29. The draft Masterplan was subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment. This concluded that the document does not discriminate against any members of the community that have 'protected characteristics.'

Other Material Implications

30. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening have been carried out on the draft Masterplan. Both conclude that SEA and HRA are not required.

Appendix

1. Summary of Consultation Responses and Proposed Amendments

APPENDIX 1 – Summary of Consultation Responses and Proposed Changes

Total Respondents: 243

The following tables summarise the key points raised by both responses to the questionnaire and emails. The 'Summary of Comments' section includes qualitative comments received by either response to the eForm questionnaire or email/post. Note that some comments were made multiple times by different respondents.

General Issues

General Objection
Total Comments: 8
Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why was the Masterplan not mentioned in the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan – how does the Masterplan relate to the Neighbourhood Plan? (Resident)• The Masterplan does not contain any firm proposals (Resident)• The map on page 31 is out of date re: development on Perrymount Road• The Masterplan does not go far enough in its environmental/zero carbon/climate change ambitions (CPRE Sussex)• The Masterplan is narrower in scope compared to the 2007 version, the boundary should be expanded (Resident)• There is little detail on how retail will be improved / additional retailers encouraged to move here (Cuckfield Parish Council)• Whilst the document notes that Haywards Heath has a diverse cultural offer, this isn't reflected on the ground (x2 Residents)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>As noted on page 14 of the draft Masterplan, the Masterplan has been prepared within the context of the adopted District Plan and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan. The content of the Masterplan builds upon proposals set out in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Town Council's "Destination Haywards Heath" document, providing supplementary detail.</p> <p>The Masterplan's role is to set out principles not make firm proposals. More detail will be required and provided as specific proposals are brought forward through the planning process.</p> <p>Officers note that the Map on P31 is now out of date and will obtain up-to-date information from Ordnance Survey.</p> <p>The Masterplan sets out proposals to encourage greater sustainable transport usage which will contribute to sustainable development aims. The role of Planning Policy in responding to climate change/zero carbon and sustainable development is a strategic matter which can be considered in the District Plan review (scheduled to commence in 2021).</p> <p>The Council carefully considered the boundary for the new Masterplan and concluded that the boundary as currently drawn reflects the area containing town centre uses.</p> <p>An adopted Masterplan will provide certainty for those making investment decisions. Improving the retail/leisure offer (e.g. proposals for The Orchards) and providing easy access (both by sustainable modes as well as by car) will encourage an improved retail and leisure offer within the Town Centre.</p>

Proposed Changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments to maps to ensure they reflect recent planning permissions and completions (e.g. Perrymount Road)

General Support
Total Comments: 6
Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supportive of the proposals (x3 Residents) The Masterplan represents an opportunity to make Haywards Heath a destination and is supported (Resident) The Masterplan correctly notes the disjointed nature of the town's key locations (Resident) Supportive of the drive to increase provision for tourism, and hope this will support surrounding villages too (Lindfield Parish Council)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
Noted
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed

General Neutral
Total Comments: 7
Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any proposals for wind turbines would require consultation with Gatwick Airport (Gatwick Airport) Not likely to have major effects on the Natural Environment, however the SPD could consider provision for Green Infrastructure (Natural England) No comments to make (Tandridge District Council / National Grid) No comments re Gas Supply for any opportunity site proposals (Southern Gas Networks) Opportunity Sites are in areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1) – no comment to make (Environment Agency) No impact on the Strategic Road Network, and support development of sustainable transport options (Highways England)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
These comments are noted. Provision for Green Infrastructure is covered by proposals related to public realm improvements and those for Victoria Park. Future proposals would also need to accord with District Plan policy DP38: Biodiversity.
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed.

Consultation
Total Comments: 9
Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better engagement is required, only found out about the consultation via Facebook Was not aware of the consultation (Resident) There has been no communication of the proposals by the Council (Resident) The consultation period was too short, and not appropriate in the run up to Christmas/ongoing pandemic (Resident)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation does not comply with the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) / Community Involvement Plan (CIP) / LGA consultation principles. (Resident / Mid Sussex Labour Party) • A public exhibition / virtual exhibition should have taken place (Resident)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>The Council is satisfied that the consultation was carried out in accordance with the SCI and CIP. The consultation ran for 6-weeks, which is two weeks longer than required by legislation for a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The consultation was publicised on the Council's social media feeds, in the local newspaper (Mid Sussex Times) and within the Council's Mid Sussex Matters magazine which is delivered to every household in the district. In addition, statutory bodies and those on the Council's Planning Policy mailing list were notified.</p> <p>The Masterplan was available to download from the Council's website. In addition, an Interactive Map was prepared so that users could navigate the town centre and click on proposals to view further information. This was viewed over 7,500 times.</p> <p>Due to restrictions in place as a result of Covid-19, it was not possible to hold a public exhibition. However, 'exhibition panels' formed part of the interactive map and were available to download from the Council's website. Given the amount of times this facility was viewed, the Council is satisfied that the content of the Masterplan was advertised sufficiently and was accessible.</p>
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed.

Vision, Objectives and Baseline

Vision, Objectives and Baseline	
Questionnaire Responses	
Do you agree with the 8 objectives for the Masterplan?	
Yes	50%
No	50%
Do you agree with the aim of encouraging economic recovery, growth and investment?	
Yes	70%
No	30%
Do you agree with the Character Areas identified?	
Yes	58%
No	42%
Do you agree with the areas that should be protected and enhanced?	
Yes	56%
No	44%
Total Responses	117
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 19	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the objectives as a fair reflection of the improvements required in Haywards Heath (Haywards Heath Town Council / Residents) 	

- Agree with the objectives that look to improve the town for pedestrians and cyclists - traffic concerns (Resident)
- Masterplan boundary should be extended to include the Dolphin and Sainsbury's as these are important aspects of the town (Resident)
- Economic growth should not be at the expense of the environment (Resident)
- The plan lacks imagination and/or vision (Resident)
- The objectives could be addressed more simply (Resident)
- Leisure provision (e.g. Clair Hall) should be protected (Resident)
- The improvements suggested go a long way to attracting investment (Resident)
- There are not enough clear proposals to attract additional retailers, SMEs, residents (Resident)
- The Masterplan does not set out a retail strategy (Resident)
- There is too much focus on retail on not on any other forms of employment (Resident)
- Objectives should consider pedestrianising key areas rather than simply 'discouraging' traffic (Resident)
- The Vision and Objectives do not set out any clear environmental/sustainability objectives, or climate change ambitions (Resident)
- The Vision and Objectives infers a range of diverse attractions and cultural facilities – disagree with this statement (Resident)
- Not sure that the Vision and Objectives would give Haywards Heath any advantage over competing towns (Resident)
- Objectives 3 and 6 should refer to street redesign so that benefits to pedestrians and cyclists can be realised, Objective 4 should include consideration of parking guidance signage/apps to help circulation (Resident)
- The contents of the report are based on flawed assumptions re: Covid, Vision and Objectives don't reflect Covid sufficiently (Resident)
- Uncertain whether the Vision and Objectives can all be delivered, some are not compatible with others (particularly the conflict between encouraging sustainable transport and parking) (Resident)
- Public Transport is an important aspect and should be mentioned (West Sussex County Council / Metrobus)

Officer Comments/Recommendations

The draft Vision and Objectives resulted from engagement with District Ward and Town Council Members to ensure they reflected the views of residents and to ensure compatibility with related documents such as the Hayward Heath Neighbourhood Plan and the Town Council's "Destination Haywards Heath".

Those that did not agree mainly raised concerns regarding culture/leisure provision and wished to see these objectives strengthened. Others were unsure whether the objectives were strong enough, however did not provide any alternative suggestions.

Comments were also received regarding the incompatibility between encouraging sustainable transport and increasing parking. Both are valid aims – the Masterplan is concerned with removing unnecessary traffic (i.e. those making through journeys or could otherwise be made by sustainable modes). However, it is also recognised that a healthy town centre relies on the ability of people to visit from further afield and their ability to park. By focussing parking in one location, as proposed, this should also relieve traffic circulation and congestion caused by seeking parking spaces.

The Masterplan recognises the Government's view that Town Centres are now reliant on more than just retail to thrive. It therefore provides a framework for encouraging

investment in a number of uses (leisure, entertainment, retail, residential), enables flexibility and accords with national policy.

The Masterplan mentions the fact that Covid-19 will change the way that town centres operate, particularly in the short-term. However, the medium-long term impacts are not yet known. The Masterplan therefore aims to set principles that are flexible to support economic recovery and growth.

Comments related to fully pedestrianising South Road/The Broadway are addressed under their separate sections below.

No additional objectives were suggested, and none were suggested for deletion.

Proposed Changes

- Amendment to objective 3 to refer to Public transport

Public Realm and Transport Improvements

Commercial Square and Station	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	24%
Agree	41%
Unsure	23%
Disagree	9%
Strongly Disagree	3%
Total Responses	91
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 7	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the proposals for artwork and better lighting to the Railway bridge (Resident) • Agree with the cycling proposals at Commercial Square but should extend to Lindfield / Scaynes Hill (Resident) • Increase in housing will increase traffic problems near the station (Resident) • Signage and wayfinding at the station is poor, agree with the proposals (Resident) • Welcome the key concepts of the Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study (2015) being taken forward. Preliminary design work and consultation for progression of schemes for South Road and Commercial Square Roundabout is currently included within the County Council Annual Delivery Programme and we welcome continuing to work with Mid Sussex District Council and other local stakeholders to progress these schemes. (West Sussex County Council) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>The majority of comments received agreed with proposals at this location.</p> <p>The proposals within the Masterplan are limited to the area within the Town Centre boundary, therefore it cannot provide detail on any suggested proposals outside the boundary.</p>	
Proposed Changes	
No amendments proposed.	

Perrymount Road	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	20%
Agree	47%
Unsure	18%
Disagree	7%
Strongly Disagree	8%
Total Responses	88
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 6	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that this is a key route between the station and town centre (x2 Residents) • A missed opportunity to rectify existing traffic problems related to the station/Waitrose (Resident) • Existing office spaces are under-utilised (Resident) • Do not agree with cycling advisory lanes (Resident) • The Masterplan should comment more fully on what the opportunities for cycle facilities are (on-road painted facilities, off-carriageway shared paths, segregated/stepped track facilities), balancing the different demands in respect of road space, in particular with regard to on-road parking. (West Sussex County Council) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>The majority of comments received agreed with proposals at this location.</p> <p>The aims and principles of the Masterplan are to encourage economic recovery and growth. By providing an attractive environment to work and live, this should encourage investors (including businesses) to the area and help with the retention of existing businesses.</p> <p>Comments were received in relation to cycling advisory lanes and cycle standards. Officers propose to seek further information from West Sussex County Council in relation to cycle opportunities and will amend the Masterplan accordingly.</p>	
Proposed Changes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify the text related to cycle improvements based on discussions with West Sussex County Council. 	

Muster Green Gyratory	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	31%
Agree	25%
Unsure	29%
Disagree	4%
Strongly Disagree	11%
Total Responses	91
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 11	

Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the gyratory is supported (Resident) • The pedestrianised area should also ensure benefit to cyclists and public transport (West Sussex County Council) • Traffic impacts of any future proposal should be modelled to establish impacts (West Sussex County Council) • Traffic through the town is not a problem, amending the gyratory is an unnecessary cost (Resident) • Taller buildings are not supported in this location (Resident) • Do not support the proposals for shared space/pedestrianisation of the area to the south of The Broadway around the Star Public House. This proposal was considered and objected to by HHTC during the development of the Atkins Report. It conflicts with our subsequent adopted policy, Destination Haywards Heath document which details our preferred delivery for a one-way gyratory system based upon known desire lines and traffic flows. (Haywards Heath Town Council) • This permanent diversion around the Broadway will add further journey time to bus services, making them less attractive to the public and may jeopardise the viability of bus services. It would be more beneficial to change this section of The Broadway to a bus/cycle only road with added bus priority traffic measures at the end to make bus travel more attractive. (Metrobus) • Further heritage work should be carried out to determine the impact on the Muster Green Conservation Area (Historic England)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>The responses to the questionnaire suggest there is strong agreement overall for the proposals for the Muster Green gyratory.</p> <p>The proposals suggested at Muster Green follow the recommendations of the Haywards Heath Transport Study (2015) as well as an independent review by Civic Engineers as part of the Masterplan consultant team. The high-level principles have therefore been tested and concluded as the most suitable way of addressing the existing gyratory. Further detailed work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.</p>
Proposed Changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add additional text to refer to the requirement to carry out detailed modelling, impact assessments and costing before progressing any scheme at this location.

The Broadway	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	29%
Agree	37%
Unsure	23%
Disagree	1%
Strongly Disagree	10%
Total Responses	90
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 11	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Broadway would be better suited to full pedestrianisation to support the food/beverage appeal of the area (x4 Residents) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with proposals to make the Broadway less attractive to traffic (Resident) • Strongly support the proposals to lose the southern end of the Broadway, can be used for markets etc. (Resident) • Encourage better signage between the Broadway and Heath Road car park (Resident) • Slowing down traffic would also slow down buses. Improvements to bus stops would be required (e.g. real time passenger information) and the current parking situation improved (Metrobus) • Do not support the proposals for shared space/pedestrianisation of the area to the south of The Broadway around the Star Public House. This proposal was considered and objected to by HHTC during the development of the Atkins Report. It moreover conflicts with our subsequent adopted policy, Destination Haywards Heath document which details our preferred delivery for a one-way gyratory system based upon known desire lines and traffic flows. (Haywards Heath Town Council) • Should highlight the impacts of the dominance of parking on the streetscape with the types of businesses on The Broadway lending themselves more to the quality of the public realm. The Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study proposed a greater level of reduction of parking along the Broadway to provide more space for pedestrians, as well as delivery restrictions at peak times. The Masterplan could set out more of the options around the level of parking provision, quality of the streetscape, space for dedicated cycle facilities, improvement of flow for bus services through The Broadway (linked to parking and width of highway), and provision of improved bus stop facilities (in particular northbound). (West Sussex County Council)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>There is strong support for the proposals at The Broadway, as it is recognised as an important food/beverage/entertainment location and is widely appreciated by residents as a distinct character area. Residents are supportive of reducing traffic and making the area more attractive for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Some comments suggested full pedestrianisation. Whilst it is known that this has been considered in the past, the route itself is still important – in particular for buses, taxis and deliveries. The Masterplan notes (page 25) that this is a Primary road. Therefore, measures within the Masterplan strike the balance between retaining this route whilst reducing traffic to enhance public realm overall and is the conclusion of the Haywards Heath Transport Study (Atkins, 2015) and Civic Engineers assessment.</p> <p>Destination Haywards Heath, prepared by the Town Council, suggests an alternative configuration for the Gyratory. However, this differs from the detail provided within the Haywards Heath Transport Study and Civic Engineers work as part of the Masterplan. As such, the Town Council's proposed configuration has not been modelled. The proposals within the Masterplan are indicative and set a framework for any future decisions, these will be subject to detailed modelling and design at the point they are brought forward, and may require adjustment in order to provide an optimal solution in terms of feasibility and design.</p> <p>The Council will continue to work with West Sussex County Council on any detailed schemes and opportunities to add The Broadway to its Annual Delivery Programme in the future. In addition, further work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.</p>
Proposed Changes
<p>No amendments proposed.</p>

South Road	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	24%
Agree	28%
Unsure	28%
Disagree	11%
Strongly Disagree	9%
Total Responses	89
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 8	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with proposals to widen pavements and decrease traffic speed (Resident) • Agree with the aims of reducing overall traffic through South Road and encouragement to use the relief road instead (Resident) • Slowing traffic down will also slow buses down – need to ensure proposals are compatible with a viable bus service. Potential for time restrictions that allow for buses only (Metrobus) • Facades of buildings in South Road are poor and need improvement (Resident) • Would like to see South Road fully pedestrianised (Resident) • Disagree with proposals for a median strip along South Road (Resident) • A carefully planned low traffic zone along South Road should be proposed (CPRE) • It is noted that the indicative plans for South Road (p.50 and p.51) contain some key amendments to feasibility plans previously identified within the Haywards Heath Town Centre Transport Study, including the addition of a central median strip and amendments to the proposed location of bus stops. The rationale for these amendments is not entirely clear and it is suggested that these issues are considered further with stakeholders, including bus companies, as part of the WSCC preliminary design development of the South Road scheme (West Sussex County Council) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>Comments received were largely supportive of the aim to reduce traffic – both volume and speed, and that the area could be more pedestrian friendly. This in turn will help drive footfall by making Haywards Heath an attractive place to visit.</p> <p>Some comments suggested full pedestrianisation. Whilst this has been considered in the past, the route is still key – the Masterplan notes on page 25 that this is a Primary road. It is important for buses, taxis and deliveries as well as passing trade. Therefore, measures within the Masterplan strike the balance between retaining this route whilst reducing traffic to enhance public realm overall.</p> <p>The Masterplan suggested a central median strip along South Road. This is indicative; it would be subject to land availability and the ability to meet design standards. Additional work since the consultation commenced suggest this may be difficult to achieve, so wording can be clarified on this point.</p> <p>The buildings on South Road are in private ownership and are a range of ages and condition, therefore the Masterplan has little control over improving numerous facades.</p>	

Preliminary design for the South Road highways scheme is being progressed by West Sussex County Council – officers will continue engagement to inform future proposals. Further work will take place as the schemes are brought forward, including detailed design (to assess feasibility and impact on any constraints/specific users), modelling and costing.

Proposed Changes

- Amend text related to the median strip, add caveat “subject to meeting required design standards and in consultation with WSCC and bus companies.”

Sussex Road

Questionnaire Responses

To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

Strongly Agree	23%
-----------------------	-----

Agree	39%
--------------	-----

Unsure	24%
---------------	-----

Disagree	3%
-----------------	----

Strongly Disagree	10%
--------------------------	-----

Total Responses	87
------------------------	-----------

Comments

Total Comments by email/post: 2

Summary of Comments

- Support - scope to encourage more walking, cycling and public transport to local schools, encouraging habits for future generations (Resident)
- Support the proposed changes to the roundabout to improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians (Resident)

Officer Comments/Recommendations

The majority of comments received were supportive of this proposal. Whilst some disagreement was indicated in the questionnaire, no explanation was provided and no objections were received by email/letter.

Proposed Changes

No amendments proposed.

Speed Limit

Questionnaire Responses

To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?

Strongly Agree	38%
-----------------------	-----

Agree	24%
--------------	-----

Unsure	12%
---------------	-----

Disagree	13%
-----------------	-----

Strongly Disagree	12%
--------------------------	-----

Total Responses	89
------------------------	-----------

Comments

Total Comments by email/post: 7

Summary of Comments

- Strongly agree with the suggestion to reduce the speed limit to 20mph (Haywards Heath Town Council / Resident)
- Speed limit changes could be implemented relatively quickly (Resident)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could be extended to surrounding roads and villages (Resident) • Risk that a change of speed limit may cause congestion (Resident)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
There was strong support, both in terms of the questionnaire response and email comments received, for this proposal. Whilst some suggested it could be extended outside the Masterplan boundary, the Masterplan can only provide guidance for areas within the boundary itself.
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed.

Cycling	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	27%
Agree	34%
Unsure	20%
Disagree	10%
Strongly Disagree	9%
Total Responses	93
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 16	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree with the proposals for improving cycling infrastructure (Resident) • Document needs to include more references to cycle parking or bike rental schemes (Resident) • Would support a proposal to extend any cycling routes into surrounding villages such as Lindfield and Cuckfield (Lindfield Parish Council / Cuckfield Parish Council) • Cycling proposals need to be worked up more fully (Resident) • Cycle design standards have progressed since the Atkins study (2015) therefore proposals will need to be considered against these design standards (West Sussex County Council) • Cycling (section 4.9) should also refer to walking and other non-motorised users (Resident) • Additional routes would be welcomed (outside the TC Masterplan boundary) (Resident) • Perrymount Road/Clair Park cycle route would be difficult to implement as it is too steep (Resident) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>There was strong support, both in terms of the questionnaire response and email comments received, for the provision of additional cycling infrastructure within the town centre.</p> <p>The role of the Masterplan is to set the framework and principles for proposals. In relation to comments about design standards and the feasibility of implementing any particular route, these will be addressed at the detailed design stage for each scheme as and when they are progressed.</p> <p>Additional commentary can be provided in the Cycling section to refer to appropriately designed and located cycle parking/storage.</p>	

Proposed Changes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional commentary regarding appropriate cycle storage • Refer to non-motorised users in section 4.9 	

Parking	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	15%
Agree	16%
Unsure	15%
Disagree	12%
Strongly Disagree	42%
Total Responses	100
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 10	
Summary of Comments	
Note: additional detail comments are addressed under Opportunity Sites (The Orchards and MSDC Car Parks) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional parking is proposed, this is in conflict with the aims to encourage sustainable transport use (Resident) • There is no evidence to suggest that motorists spend a long time searching for a parking space (Resident) • The smaller car parks are welcomed and are vital for people to access services (Resident) • There is no mention of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (Resident) • Car parking capacity should be maintained not reduced (Resident) • Free parking should be provided to encourage shoppers/visitors (Resident) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>The provision of sufficient parking is vital to encourage additional visitors to the town centre. Whilst the Masterplan supports sustainable transport modes (to encourage those that wish to travel by such modes to use them) it is recognised that some users will require the use of a private car.</p> <p>The Masterplan proposes consolidating car parking into one car park – potentially a multi-storey at The Orchards. This will provide visitors a ‘go to’ destination and will be an efficient way of increasing parking capacity as well as reducing traffic movements in the town centre. It should be noted that the closure of smaller car parks will be subject to additional future work through the Council’s Parking Investment Strategy, which will consider capacity and other measures. Any closure of car parks will be subject to the outcomes of this work, and the assurances that sufficient parking capacity exists in the town centre to meet current and demand.</p> <p>Similarly, it is not the role of the Masterplan to determine fee regimes – this will be reviewed in line with the Council’s Parking Strategy (2020).</p>	
Proposed Changes	
No amendments proposed.	

Victoria Park	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	30%
Agree	37%
Unsure	18%
Disagree	4%
Strongly Disagree	11%
Total Responses	91
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 9	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The raised area between South Road and Victoria Park could be better utilised as a community space (x3 Residents) Disagree with the removal of the hedge on South Road, as this provides a landscape buffer between open space and the road / screening (x5 Residents) HHTC supports the improvement and vision for Victoria Park and looks forward to the delivery progression of the Victoria Park Masterplan, following our earlier representations. (Haywards Heath Town Council) 	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
<p>Comments received were largely supportive of this proposal, particularly the role that Victoria Park plays in providing leisure and open space within the town centre. It was also recognised as having potential for community uses.</p> <p>Opinion was divided on the proposed removal of the hedge along South Road. Whilst five residents felt that this provides a vital landscape barrier/buffer, others indicated that opening up Victoria Park would help integrate it better with The Broadway and South Road, and could provide opportunities for alternative uses on the northern boundary.</p>	
Proposed Changes	
No amendments proposed.	

Gateways and Wayfinding	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	27%
Agree	37%
Unsure	22%
Disagree	2%
Strongly Disagree	12%
Total Responses	88
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 11	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction of gateways would help form the Town Centre's identity (Resident) Support the idea of improved signage and wayfinding, particularly if by local artists (x4 Residents) Concerned that too much signage would mean clutter (x2 Residents) Signage to parking and public transport would be a benefit (x2 Residents) Why invent a 'gateway' if one already exists (Muster Green) (Resident) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The addition of signage and gateways would not benefit existing residents as they are already aware of their town (Resident)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
The principle around improving navigation around the town was largely supported. In particular, it was felt that tourists and visitors would benefit – especially those likely to be arriving by public transport or other sustainable modes. There was support for wayfinding and signage to be locally distinctive (potentially by local artists) and to avoid clutter.
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed.

Other Small Scale Improvements	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	21%
Agree	42%
Unsure	21%
Disagree	6%
Strongly Disagree	10%
Total Responses	84
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 0	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
These proposals were largely supported, based on the questionnaire response. No comments were provided on this matter.	
Proposed Changes	
No amendments proposed.	

Meanwhile Uses	
Questionnaire Responses	
To What Extent do you agree with the proposal?	
Strongly Agree	21%
Agree	30%
Unsure	38%
Disagree	5%
Strongly Disagree	6%
Total Responses	81
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 0	
Officer Comments/Recommendations	
These proposals were largely supported, based on the questionnaire response. No comments were provided on this matter.	
Proposed Changes	
No amendments proposed.	

Opportunity Sites

The Orchards	
Questionnaire Responses	
Do you agree with the principle of encouraging non-retail uses (such as leisure) to The Orchards?	
Yes	63%
No	37%
Do you agree that public realm improvements would make The Orchards more inviting?	
Yes	62%
No	38%
Do you agree that The Orchards should be the focus for enhanced car parking within the town centre?	
Yes	44%
No	56%
Total Responses	117
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 28	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional retail, town growth, residential and leisure facility at The Orchards would necessitate more parking provision (x4 Residents) • Would like to see new cinema/theatre/leisure facility on this site (x4 Residents) • Would be a good location for the local library (Resident) • Providing other uses here is a good idea and will help retain existing tenants by ensuring footfall (Resident) • The Orchards is a shopping centre, why is leisure proposed here? (Resident) • A better mix of shops / additional shops / more chains are required in the Orchards to drive footfall (Resident) • The Masterplan should be more prescriptive in what the 'leisure facility' on this site would be (Resident) • Has to be a balance between leisure and retail (Resident) • Support additional budget supermarket (Resident) • Night time economy is important as currently the centre is 'dead' after 5pm (Resident) • Disagree with residential development proposed for The Orchards (Resident) • Agree with provision of a multi-storey – parking is under significant pressure (x4 Residents) • Multi-storey would be over-dominating and too 'urban' / eyesore (x2 Residents) • Multi-storey car parks are not as safe as surface car parks (x2 Residents) • There is no need to increase car parking provision, multi-storey is not required (x5 Residents) • Focusing parking on The Orchards site would be detrimental to retailers adjacent to existing (smaller) car parks (Organisation) Orchards should include secure cycle hubs/parking (Resident) • The Orchards is dark and claustrophobic, removing the canopies would help (Resident) • Removal of the canopies in the northern end has not improved the centre (Resident) • The Orchards feels tired and in need of a facelift (Resident) 	

Officer Comments/Recommendations

Responses to the questionnaire suggested support for encouraging non-retail uses within The Orchards. This reflects recent Government changes to the Use Class order to attract non-retail uses to ensure that town centres remain vibrant and viable. Given the challenging times for retail (even before the Covid-19 pandemic) it will be vital to encourage other uses which will drive footfall and ensure that the town centre remains a focus for the community.

Respondents suggested that leisure uses would be supported overall – in particular, a cinema/gym/community building/library were raised. However, it is recognised that there needs to be a balance between leisure and retail, and that there has to be sufficient parking (as well as sustainable transport) to accommodate these uses.

Whilst it is not in the Masterplan's control to dictate the balance of retail or assign specific retailers, the improvements that can be made at the Orchards, in terms of encouraging multiple uses and public realm improvements, will assist in encouraging retailers to open premises in the centre by providing a welcoming and successful retail environment to trade in.

Concern was raised over the proposals for a multi-storey at The Orchards. These related to design (they are urbanising, and will impact on amenity of nearby residents), safety (they feel unsafe by comparison to surface car parks) parking fees and need. Further detail can be provided within the Masterplan to strengthen the principles regarding design. Other elements, including the need and capacity will be assessed further under a separate workstream (e.g. work arising from the recently adopted Parking Strategy).

Proposed Changes

- Strengthen design elements, particularly in relation to the multi-storey car park proposal (refer to Design Guide SPD)
- Refer to Parking Strategy

Clair Hall

Questionnaire Responses

Do you agree with the aims and principles set out for the site on p.72?

Yes	38%
No	62%

Do you think there is a need for a community facility in the town?

Yes	81%
No	19%

What features would you expect a modern future facility to include?

- Multi-purpose – wide range of uses
- Cinema
- Voluntary Spaces
- Citizens Advice
- Small theatre
- Performance venue (live music/comedy/theatre)
- Restaurant/Bar
- Public meeting space
- Venue with retractable seating / flexibility
- No need for a permanent stage
- Art gallery
- Health facility/blood donation/etc

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same uses as existing – but modernised 	
Would you support provision of a community facility if it required public subsidy?	
Partial Subsidy	49%
Full Subsidy	45%
No Subsidy	6%
Do you think it should be included in the Clair Hall site?	
Yes	72%
No	28%
If no, do you have any suggestions for an alternative location for such a facility?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orchards (x3) • Anywhere in Haywards Heath as long as it is accessible • Don't only limit the search to the Clair Hall site, look for other opportunities • Somewhere nearer the Broadway/South Road • Unlikely to find somewhere with the same parking provision • Redevelopment of the space between Poundland and Lloyds Bank on South Road • Hazelgrove Road (currently occupied by Car Park/Tesco) • Activities could be moved to venues such as Haywards Heath Social Club or church halls 	
Total Responses	117
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 66	
Summary of Comments	
<p>The Masterplan consultation asked a series of questions related to the Clair Hall site. These sought views on the content within the Masterplan but also sought the community's views on the permanent closure of Clair Hall. The response to these additional questions will be used to inform the assessment of need, in line with the requirement of the first principle of the Masterplan and will help to inform decisions about the future provision of community facilities.</p> <p>Comments related to the closure and potential redevelopment of Clair Hall included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamental objection to closure (i.e. no redevelopment) • Redwood Centre should be retained • Cinema/Theatre/Community Building should replace Clair Hall • Redevelopment is required (e.g. current facilities are not fit-for-purpose) • No alternative venues have been suggested / there are no alternatives in Haywards Heath • Clair Hall has been underused as it is badly managed / lack of investment • Should re-open until alternatives are found / planned for • Existing building should be improved/replaced • Site should contain a community building, not housing • Closure process is unlawful / not justified / no consultation • Agree with redevelopment, however proposals need to be clearer • Alternative venues could be used • Clair Hall is considered in the past tense ("it was" rather than "it is") (Resident) • There is a lack of commentary on the Clair Hall closure in this section (Resident) • Any redevelopment would need to protect The Heath Conservation Area (Clair Park) (Historic England) 	

Officer Comments/Recommendations

The role of the Masterplan is to provide principles for any future redevelopment of the site, recognising the fact that the site presents an Opportunity for redevelopment (as identified in the previously adopted 2007 Haywards Heath Town Centre Masterplan). Decisions related to its closure and any future uses are not matters for the Masterplan. Comments received during the consultation process will inform any decisions made regarding the future provision of community facilities.

The first principle for any redevelopment is “An assessment to establish the need for such a facility, and whether community facilities could be re-provided on site or elsewhere within the town”.

In total, 62% of respondents did not agree with the Aims and Principles. However, the written comments that accompanied this question relate to the principle of closure of the existing building rather than the principles set out in the Masterplan.

The Masterplan contains principles for any future redevelopment, these include the relationship to Clair Park, The Heath Conservation Area, important trees, access/crossings and potential for active ground floor uses.

It is suggested, to amend the text to clarify that the additional principles only apply once the first principle (related to establishing a need/re-provision) has been satisfied.

Proposed Changes

- Amend the Aims and Principles to clarify that the principles only apply once the first principle has been satisfied.

MSDC Owned Car Parks

Questionnaire Responses

Do you agree with the principle for these sites set out on p.73?

Yes	32%
No	68%
Total Responses	117

Comments

Total Comments by email/post: 33

Summary of Comments

- Object to the redevelopment of Car Parks C, D and E for residential as this would urbanise the town centre (Resident)
- Disagree that 3-4 storey buildings would be appropriate (Resident)
- Removal of the car parks for residential – where would new residents park? (Resident)
- Parking provision is required to support retailers on Sussex Road and Haywards Road, object to the removal of the smaller car parks (x14 Residents/Organisations)
- Surface car parks are safer than a multi-storey, existing car parks should therefore be retained (Resident)
- Removal of these car parks would make some areas of the town less accessible, particularly those with impaired mobility (Resident)
- There is no evidence to suggest that motorists spend a long time searching for a parking space (x2 Resident)
- The Car Park in Franklynn Road is used by residents who would find parking difficult without this facility (Resident)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should ensure there is sufficient parking provision before closure, to ensure the Town Centre attracts visitors (Resident) • The smaller car parks are likely to be less expensive to park in than a multi-storey (Resident) • Site E Franklynn Road car park – Any new development at this site would need to protect the setting of The Priory. (Historic England)
Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>The Masterplan concludes that the three smaller car parks (C, D and E) present an opportunity for redevelopment.</p> <p>It should be noted that the closure of smaller car parks will be subject to additional future work through the Council's Parking Investment Strategy (a key action in the Parking Strategy), which will consider capacity and other measures. Any closure of car parks will be subject to the outcomes of this work, and the assurances that sufficient parking capacity exists in the town centre to meet demand.</p> <p>It is suggested that this is clarified in this section.</p>
Proposed Changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include additional supporting text to explain that the decision to close any of the car parks will be subject to additional assessment through the Parking Investment Strategy (arising from the Parking Strategy). This will be subject to sufficient parking capacity being demonstrated.

Additional Opportunity Sites	
Questionnaire Responses	
Do you agree with the principle for sites F-M set out on p.67?	
Yes	32%
No	68%
Are there any other opportunity sites within the Masterplan boundary with potential for improvement?	
Yes	15%
No	85%
Total Responses	117
Comments	
Total Comments by email/post: 8	
Summary of Comments	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stockwell Court should be added to the list of Opportunity Sites (x2 Residents) • Agree with the proposals for the old Woolworths store (site I) (Resident) • Identification of residential Opportunity Sites (e.g. Barbican Court – site H) – require clarity of future plans for existing residents (Resident) • Support the proposals for 2 The Broadway (site G), suggested wording change to refer to 5 storeys to reflect live planning application (Nexus Planning - Promoter) • The Priory (site K) – Any new development here would need to be sensitive to and contextual with the historic architecture of The Priory irrespective of the architectural approach taken. (Historic England) • Most are too aspirational and therefore unlikely to come to fruition (Resident) • What would happen to existing occupiers (e.g. Texaco, Royal Mail and Fire Station)? (Residents) • Too much emphasis on increasing residential (resident) 	

Officer Comments/Recommendations
<p>Whilst 68% disagreed with the principles for the additional opportunity sites, the accompanying comments do not reflect general disagreement to the individual proposals. Instead, comments disagree with the overall principle of additional residential within the town centre (particularly at South Road), traffic generation as a result, and the loss of car parks (which is unrelated to this question and dealt with under a separate issue). Some disagreeing with the draft principles were doing so because they suggested additional sites for inclusion.</p> <p>Questions were raised regarding the viability and availability of these sites, in particular those that are currently occupied. The Masterplan addresses this, however amendments could be made to make this clearer.</p> <p>A number of comments suggested that Stockwell Court should be added to the list of additional opportunity sites. Given that this is a significant flatted development above a range of mixed-use units and given the high number of different ownerships within the building, it is unlikely that a viable and deliverable scheme could be developed within the timeframe of the Masterplan however reference can be added to improving shop facades on this site.</p>
Proposed Changes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor amendment to Site G “2 The Broadway” to reflect recent planning application • Review current text related to availability/viability to provide clarity • Add additional wording related to improving shop façades at Stockwell Court

Policy Interventions and Implementation

Policy Interventions
Total Comments by email/post: 1
Summary of Comments
MSDC should resist changes that diminish the availability of good quality office space in Perrymount Road.
Officer Comments/Recommendations
Officers agree with the above statement. However, Permitted Development rights are outside of the control of planning policy. However, the District Plan (policy DP1: Sustainable Economic Development) and proposed Sites DPD policy SA34: Existing Employment Sites provide policy support for the retention of existing employment space.
Proposed Changes
No amendments proposed.

Implementation
Total Comments by email/post: 6
Summary of Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information on funding sources/specifics would be welcomed • There is too much risk for the Council in funding the schemes proposed • HHTC anticipates involvement in the detailed development of the Masterplan as individual projects are promoted for delivery, not simply as a consultee after the

<p>plan is drawn up. We aim to cooperate and support MSDC so that we can champion the best solutions to improve the town for its residents (Haywards Heath Town Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The table on p.78 of the report also implies schemes for The Broadway, Perrymount Road and Sussex Road suggests are identified for further progression within our Local Transport Improvement Programme but this is not currently the case so should be clarified. (West Sussex County Council) • For simplicity it would be helpful to amend references to Local Transport Improvement Programme to Annual Delivery Programme as the specific delivery mechanism for schemes varies depending on the size of scheme. (West Sussex County Council) • Please note that inclusion of any scheme on the Annual Delivery Programme is subject to funding opportunities and prioritisation amongst schemes across West Sussex. (West Sussex County Council)
<p>Officer Comments/Recommendations</p> <p>The responses relate to the need for additional clarity on next steps, or to state intentions to support any future work. The Implementation Strategy cannot presently set out the types/sources of funding for every project as these are unknown – this is because the Masterplan sets the framework rather than being the vehicle for delivery. The individual workstreams within the Implementation Strategy will each provide more detail where relevant, as and when they are progressed.</p>
<p>Proposed Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional text to set out examples of funding sources, and explanation that schemes are subject to funding being secured will be added. • Additional clarity to set out that the Masterplan is not the vehicle for delivery of future schemes, however provides a framework • Amend text to clarify the position related to WSCC's Local Transport Improvement Programme and amend to Annual Delivery Programme

This page is intentionally left blank

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE FOR HOUSING, PLANNING AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21

REPORT OF: Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services
Contact Officer: Alison Hammond, Member Services Officer
Email: alison.hammond@midsussex.gov.uk Tel: 01444 477227
Wards Affected: All
Key Decision: No

Purpose of Report

1. For the Scrutiny Committee for Housing and Planning and Economic growth to note its Work Programme for 2020/21.

Summary

2. Members are asked to note the attached Work Programme. The Work Programme will be reviewed as the final piece of business at each meeting, enabling additional business to be agreed as required.

Recommendations

3. **The Committee are recommended to note the Committee's Work Programme as set out at paragraph 5 of this report.**
-

Background

4. It is usual for Committees to agree their Work Programme at the first meeting of a new Council year and review it at each subsequent meeting to allow for the scrutiny of emerging issues during the year.

The Work Programme

5. The Committee's Work Programme for 2020/21 is set out below:

Meeting Date	Item	Reason for Inclusion
17 March 2021	TBC	

Policy Context

6. The Work Programme should ideally reflect the key priorities of the Council, as defined in the Corporate Plan and Budget.

Financial Implications

7. None.

Risk Management Implications

8. None.

Background Papers

None.